

REMARKS

Initially, the applicant would like to sincerely thank Examiner Woods for his time and attention during the interview on Sept. 20, 2006 and for identifying this case as a potentially related case to Application Serial Nos. 10/693,633 and 10/401,717, which were also interviewed on the same day.

The Office action dated June 5, 2006 rejected claims 1-4, 18, 20, 28, 36, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,242 B1 to Itoh et al. ("Itoh") in view of *Scalable Vector Graphics specification version 1.1* revised January 14, 2003 ("SVG"). Further, the Office action rejected claims 5-17, 19, 21-27, 30-35, 37-64, and 66-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh in view of SVG and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0110490 to Steele et al. ("Steele"). Further yet, the Office action rejected claims 1-67 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Still further, the Office action rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph and second paragraph as being directed to subject matter not enabled by the specification. Finally, the Office action provisionally rejected claim 1 as being directed to subject matter also claimed in copending U.S. Patent application 10/693,633.

By this paper, claim 1 is amended such that claims 1-66 remain pending. Claims 1, 36, and 65 are independent claims which remain at issue.

A response to the above office action, "Amendment C", has already been filed on August 31, 2006 by Albert S. Michalik, the previous attorney of record. This amendment, Supplemental Amendment "D" was prepared and is filed as per the discussion with Examiner Woods during the interview of Sep. 20, 2006, concerning related cases 10/401,717 (WN 13768.783.20) and 10/693,633 (WN 13768.783.20.1). This supplemental amendment incorporates into claim 1 the language discussed with Examiner Woods during the Sep. 20 interview.

It is also noted that a terminal disclaimer is being filed with this paper and corresponding to U.S. Patent application 10/693,633, thereby overcoming the provisional double patenting rejection.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 23rd day of October, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:sa
W:\13768\783.230\DS0000006740V001.DOC